



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,625	10/14/2003	Gary Jon Boudrieau	004811202001	2624
500	7590	10/18/2005	EXAMINER	
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC 701 FIFTH AVE SUITE 6300 SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092			SWARTHOUT, BRENT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2636	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/605,625

Applicant(s)

BOUDRIEU, GARY JON

Examiner

Brent A. Swarthout

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2636

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

a. Claims 1,2,4-6 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Mardirossian and Manion.

Nelson discloses an aircraft anti-crash system for controlling an airplane by autopilot responsive to commands from a remote guidance facility (abstract), the ground station inherently using communicating and computing means in order to provide guidance back to an aircraft, except for specifically stating that control is automatic or that system is capable of protecting aircraft at all times.

Mardirossian discloses automatic control of an aircraft from a ground facility 29 in order to prevent crash into undesired areas (abstract).

Manion teaches desirability of providing collision protection for an aircraft at all times including against obstacles in the air or on the ground (col.4, lines 64-68; col.11, lines 37-41).

It would have been obvious to use automatic control as suggested by Mardirossian in conjunction with an aircraft protection system as disclosed by Nelson, and to utilize a collision avoidance system as taught by Manion in conjunction with the ground collision avoidance technique used by Nelson, in order to more quickly gain control over an aircraft

when it is not properly controlled, and to provide continuous protection for an aircraft against various types of collisions, thus providing greater safety for aircraft occupants.

Furthermore, Nelson would have prevented control by ground based systems and an on-board autopilot, since Nelson teaches that remote control can be from an aircraft (col.5, lines 50-53) and that onboard autopilot controls can be disabled (col.8, lines 34-35).

Regarding claim 4, Manion teaches desirability of having a ground based object transmit signals indicative of distance and height to the anti-crash system (col. 4, line 65- col. 5, line 19).

Regarding claim 5, Mardirossian uses control by proper authorities 29.

Regarding claim 6, Mardirossian allows monitoring of aircraft functions such as altitude (col.3, line 33).

Regarding claim 15, Nelson teaches ability to control aircraft from another aircraft (col.5, line 52).

Regarding claim 16, Nelson teaches control by government security authorities (col.5, lines 34-35).

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Mardirossian, Manion and McBain.

McBain teaches desirability of controlling an aircraft on a course away from protected objects as established before an aircraft takes off (col.5, lines 21-35).

It would have been obvious to use a set course to control an aircraft in a system as disclosed by Nelson, Mardirossian and Manion in order to prevent an aircraft from crashing into protected objects.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Mardirossian, Manion and Murray et al.

Mardirossian teaches desirability of transmitting video data from an aircraft to ground (col. 3, line 37), except for use of audio feed.

Murray teaches desirability of providing audio cockpit data to a remote station in order to monitor cockpit conditions during an emergency (col. 14, lines 13-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include audio data for transmission to a central station as suggested by Murray in conjunction with a system as disclosed by Nelson, Mardirossian and Manion, in order to more accurately determine cockpit conditions so as to be able to best control an aircraft for specific conditions .

4. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.


In claim 8, line 3 "the ground-based object" has no antecedent basis.

5. Claims 8-9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent A Swarthout whose telephone number is 571-272-2979. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Hofsass, can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Brent A Swarthout
Art Unit 2636

**BRENT A. SWARTHOUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**